REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-38. Claim 9 was objected to and claims 1-38 were rejected. By this amendment, claims 1-8 and 35-38 have been canceled, and independent claims 9, 13, 22, 23, 30, and 32 have been amended. New claims 39-43 have been added.

Claim 9 was objected to because of an informality. The first occurrence of the term "the third video standard" has been amended to read "a third video standard."

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sokawa et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,460. In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, the Applicant has canceled claims 1, 2, 5 and 6. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue the canceled claims in a continuation application.

Claims 3, 4, 13-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokawa et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,460.

In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, the Applicant has canceled claims 3 and 4. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue the canceled claims in a continuation application.

The rejection of claims 13-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokawa et al. is respectfully traversed. Sokawa et al. presents a display device

capable of displaying a video signal having a predetermined display format; a plurality of video signal sources; a selection circuit for selecting one of a plurality of video signals output from the plurality of video signal sources; and an image processor for converting a format of the video signal selected by the selection circuit into the predetermined display format, wherein a video signal output from the processor is supplied to the display device.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Fig.24 of Sokawa et al. to reject the claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that neither the Figures nor the specification of Sokawa et al. disclose or suggest converting various video signals with different video formats to a standard of the bus. For example, Fig.24 shows a monitor output signal labeled as "PC" from a personal computer going through an A/D converter to be converted to a digital signal. Fig.24 also shows a base-band signal labeled as "BB" from a VTR going through an A/D converter to be converted to a digital signal.

However, the digital signals in Sokawa et al. are not formatted to a bus standard. Both digital signals output from the A/D converters to the bus may represent video data with different video formats ("a reproduced video signal having any of the 18 types of display formats is output from the ATV decoder...", col. 29, lines 43-45). After passing through the bus, the image processor converts the video signal into a display format used by the display device. (col. 29, lines 49-52).

Sokawa et al. does not disclose or suggest the use of an image processor between the input A/D converters and the bus to perform video format conversion. Sokawa discloses converting variously formatted signals to a display format after the bus and before the display device. Therefore, Sokawa et al. does not disclose or suggest converting signals to a standard of the bus where all signals on the bus represent video data with the same video format. Consequently, Sokawa et al. does not disclose or suggest converting various video signals with different video formats to a bus standard.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 13 and 22 to more clearly recite that the first input module converts the first analog video signal from a standard of the first video source to a bus standard, and the second input module converts the second analog video signal from a standard of the second video source to the bus standard. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 13 and 22 and their respective dependent claims 14-21 are not rendered obvious by Sokawa et al.

Claims 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokawa et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,460 in view of Burton, U.S. Pat. No. 5,528,283.

In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, the Applicant has canceled claims 7 and 8. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue the canceled claims in a continuation application.

The rejection of claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokawa et al. in view of Burton is respectfully traversed.

As presented above, Sokawa et al. does not disclose or suggest converting various video signals with different video formats to a bus standard. Likewise, Sokawa et al. does not disclose or suggest a bus attached to the first and second input modules and having its own video standard. Consequently, Sokawa et al. does not disclose or suggest converting a first input video signal from a first video standard to a third video standard, a second input video signal from a second video standard to the third video standard, and a bus attached to the first and second input modules and having the third video standard.

Burton presents a communication system for the distribution of switched video that can dynamically allocate video channels to subscribers using a pool of switched channel selector units. As described in the specification, buses carrying video signals at multiple frequencies are used to provide video channels to individual receiver units. (col. 3, line 10 to col. 4, line 30). An RF bus selector 60 connects an individual receiver unit to a selected bus. A tuner 62 is used to convert the desired video information signal to an intermediate frequency, for example, the frequency used by U.S. receivers. Burton discloses buses carrying video signals at multiple frequencies.

Burton does not disclose or suggest converting the format of signals to a video standard of the bus. Consequently, Burton does not disclose or suggest converting a first input video signal from a first video standard to a third video standard, a second input

video signal from a second video standard to the third video standard, and a bus attached to the first and second input modules and having the third video standard.

As presented above, neither Sokawa et al. nor Burton discloses or suggests converting signals to a video standard of a bus. Consequently, neither Sokawa et al. nor Burton, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest converting a first input video signal from a first video standard to a third video standard, a second input video signal from a second video standard to the third video standard, and a bus attached to the first and second input modules and having the third video standard as claimed in claim 9. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 9 and its dependent claims 10-12 are not rendered obvious by Sokawa et al. in view of Burton.

Claims 23-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokawa et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,460 in view of Sommer et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,297,785.

In order to expedite prosecution of the present application, the Applicant has canceled claims 35-38. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue the canceled claims in a continuation application.

The rejection of claims 23-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokawa et al. in view of Sommer et al. is respectfully traversed. As presented above, Sokawa et al. does not disclose or suggest converting various video signals with different video formats to a video standard of the bus. Likewise, Sokawa et al. does not

disclose or suggest first and second input modules that convert analog video signals to a bus standard.

Sommer et al. discloses operation of a plurality of visual display units from one screen controller. As shown in Figure 1 of Sommer, a dual scan LCD visual display unit is split into an upper region and a lower region. The upper region is connected to a visual display unit control unit via an upper data bus UDB, and the lower region is connected to a visual display unit control unit via a lower data bus LDB -- the visual display unit control unit 10 being a VGA controller. A control bus CB is provided which is allocated to both screen regions and on which the clock and control signals are carried. The VGA controller is driven via a bus 14 from the arithmetic unit 12 of a PC. However, Sommer et al. does not disclose or suggest converting various video signals with different video formats to a video standard of the bus. Consequently, Sommer et al. does not disclose or suggest first and second input modules that convert analog video signals to a bus standard.

As presented above, Sokawa et al. does not disclose or suggest first and second input modules that convert analog video signals to a bus standard. Likewise, Sommer et al. does not disclose or suggest first and second input modules that convert analog video signals to a bus standard. Consequently, neither Sokawa et al. nor Sommer et al., alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a first input module that converts a first analog video signal from a standard of a first video source to a bus standard and a second input

module that converts a second analog video signal from a standard of a second video source to the bus standard.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 23, 30, and 32 to more clearly recite that the input modules convert an analog video signal from a standard of a video source to a bus standard. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 23, 30, and 32 and their respective dependent claims 24-29, 31, and 33-34 are not rendered obvious by Sokawa et al. in view of Sommer et al.

Additionally, dependent claims 39-43 have been added to claim a standard of the bus that includes an aspect ratio of a video image. The cited prior art does not disclose or suggest a standard of the bus that includes an aspect ratio of a video image.

Moreover, throughout the Office Action the Examiner has made various statements in conjunction with the obviousness rejections without citing support for the statements in any of the prior art. Additionally, in several instances, the Examiner admits that a claim element is not shown in the prior art, but proceeds to find the claim element obvious nonetheless. Because of the manner in which the statements are worded, the Applicant is unsure if these statements are intended to constitute Official Notice on the part of the Examiner. In case the Examiner is taking Official Notice, for example, of facts in the Examiner's personal knowledge rather than the prior art, the Applicant respectfully traverses each of the Examiner's assertions. Under MPEP § 2144.03, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is now obligated to cite references in

support of the Examiner's assertions. Alternatively, if the Examiner's assertions are based on facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner, the Applicant respectfully submits that the facts must be supported by an affidavit from the Examiner. More specifically, the Applicant traverses the Examiner's assertions with regard to the following:

With regard to claims 3, 10 and 18, the Examiner admitted that Sokawa et al. does not specifically disclose whether the input module (A/D) would be a dual input module. The Examiner then took Official Notice stating:

> "that dual-input devices are notoriously well known in the art and, thus, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sokawa et al. by providing a dual-input device so that the user may choose one input signal from the dual input signals and more importantly by using a dual-input device the system would eliminate the need for another input module and save cost of the system by making it more compact."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. Sokawa et al. does not convert the input signals to a bus standard and nothing in the cited prior art presents a system with dual-input devices that convert input signals to a bus standard. Consequently, combining the input modules of Sokawa would not produce the dual-input devices of claims 3, 10 or 18.

With regard to claim 4, 11 and 19, the Examiner admitted that Sokawa et al. does not specifically disclose a dual-output module. The Examiner then took Official Notice stating:

> "that dual-output device are notoriously well known in the art and, thus, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sokawa by providing a dual-output module so that another output module would be eliminated from the circuitry which would save cost of the system because the system would be more compact."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. Sokawa et al. does not convert signals from a bus standard and nothing in the cited prior art presents a system with dual-output devices that convert output signals from a bus standard. Consequently, combining the output modules of Sokawa would not produce the dual-output devices of claim 4, 11 or 19.

With regard to claim 17, the Examiner took Official Notice that a foot-pedal for controlling a computer is notoriously well-known in the art, and stated:

> "that foot-pedal for controlling a computer is notoriously well known in the art and, therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sokawa et al. by providing a foot pedal to control the system so that a disabled viewer would be able to control the system with the pedal and be able to enjoy the entertainment that the television system provides."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. None of the cited prior art provides a system with foot pedals. Likewise, none of the cited prior art provides a system for converting video standards that includes a foot pedal for controlling a computer that controls an input selection and control device. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the system of Sokawa et al. to produce the system of claim 17.

With regard to claim 24, 37 and 38, the Examiner took Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to display for example two or four signals in equal number of quadrants on the screen of a display, and stated:

> "It would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sokawa by providing a display capable of displaying multiple signals in quadrants, in order for a user to be able to view more than one signal on a screen at a time."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. None of the cited prior art provides a system that converts analog video signals to a bus standard and wherein a portion of each image from the signals is displayed on the same display device. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the system of Sokawa et al. to produce the system of claim 24, 37 or 38.

With regard to claim 25, the Examiner took Official Notice that it is well known in the art that a blank space around a display device is formed due to aspect ratio differences of the display device and the input video signal in such displays as when aspect ratios utilized for wide screen or 16:9 vis-à-vis the 4:3 aspect ratio, and stated:

> "It would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sokawa by providing padding or blank space around the window or the background signal in order to make the signals compatible with the desired output display device."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. None of the cited prior art provides a system that converts analog video signals to a bus standard, wherein the bus drives an output module to convert the video signals, and wherein a portion of each image from the signals is displayed together on the same display device. Furthermore,

none of the cited prior art provides a system that provides padding adjacent at least a portion of each image that is displayed together on the same display device. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the system of Sokawa et al. to produce the system of claim 25.

With regard to claim 31 and 38, the Examiner took Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art to display a signal in a window such as PIP or onscreen display, overlaying it on a background/main signal, and stated:

> "television signals are capable of displaying in a window while the main signal is displayed in the background. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Sokawa by providing a display capable of displaying a signal in a window or PIP or OSD type signal, in order for a user to be able to view more than one signal at same time."

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement. None of the cited prior art provides a system that converts analog video signals to a bus standard, an ISC for selecting one of the first and second signals to supply window images and the other to supply background images, or positions images in quadrants. Consequently, the Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the system of Sokawa et al. to produce the system of claim 31 or 38.

Applicant respectfully traverses these assertions by the Examiner. The Examiner's assertions are not well known in the art as evidenced by the cited prior art, Sokawa et al, Burton, and Sommer et al. If the Examiner's assertions were well known, they would appear in the prior art. However, even after the Examiner's exhaustive

search, the Examiner has been unable to find any references teaching the Examiner's assertions. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assertions are not commonly known in the art and the Examiner's findings of Official Notice are respectfully traversed.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-34 and 39-43 should be in condition for allowance. The Applicant looks forward to working with the Examiner to resolve any remaining issues in the application. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of GTC, account number 070845.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 10, 2004

David R. Beto
Registration No. 51,467

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100